Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



FINSTITUTE
FRICULTURE
9200 EDMONSTON RD STE 117
GREENBELT MD 20770-1551

EVALUATING JOINT EFFECTS OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS

by

Claude F. Bennett

Joint Planning and Evaluation Staff Paper

United States Department of Agriculture Science and Education Administration Washington, D.C. 20250



EVALUATING JOINT EFFECTS OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS

by

Claude F. Bennett

Joint Planning and Evaluation Staff Paper Number 81-PA-03

March 1981

Joint Planning and Evaluation
Science and Education Administration
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of the Science and Education Administration or the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

PREFACE

This paper is a revision of a presentation at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, held in August 1980, at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Reviews of drafts of this paper were provided by Patrick Boyle, Program and Staff Development, University of Wisconsin-Extension; Molly Frantz, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President; Robert Frary, Program Development, Coordination and Evaluation, Science and Education Administration-Extension; Walter Hess, Community and Economic Development Division, United States General Accounting Office; John Michael and Jane Roth, both of the Program Analysis Staff, Science and Education Administration, USDA; and Robin Williams, Department of Sociology, Cornell University. Although their comments were helpful to the author, mention of the reviewers here does not indicate their responsibility for nor necessarily their agreement with the contents of this paper.

The author would like to express his appreciation to John M. Brazzel,

Chief, Program Analysis Staff, SEA, for support and encouragement in completing
this paper for publication in the Joint Planning and Evaluation Staff Paper

Series.

The author also appreciates the unwavering dedication of Mrs. Gloria Robinson, Program Analysis Staff, in formatting and typing this paper.

rises from and is emission of a construction as the companies of the construction of t

Prigrate of drofts of this peace were provided to Postici Pario, prace as a start investment. Mostly increased the start investment. Mostly increased the start investment of Succession of Microsoft in the Start in

The prince would be to express of a series to date a date and series.

Program Analysis Staff, SSA, for support and accompanion in commercial staff and contraction in the date Planning and Contraction in the date Planning and Contraction in the date of the contraction of the con

The outher also appropriate the unwelling new capton of the large state of the large state of the state of th

EVALUATING JOINT EFFECTS OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS

ABSTRACT

Policy-makers, legislators and the public should know the joint effects of Extension's various programs, in addition to knowing the results of single Extension programs and program areas. Evaluating Extension's programs (e.g., urban horticulture) or program areas (e.g., agriculture, or home economics) simply on a one-by-one basis can lead to misestimates of the total amount of resources which should be allocated to Extension in order to accomplish State and Federal priorities.

Studies on the impacts of Cooperative Extension work are almost always confined to programs within one of the agency's four major program areas—agriculture (and natural resources), home economics (and nutrition), 4-H youth and community and rural development. Extension's accountability efforts usually produce only separate reports on each of these four program areas. Extension's response to a recent Congressional mandate to evaluate economic and social consequences of Extension program was found to lack assessment of the inter-relatedness of Extension's program areas.

Previous, limited efforts to examine the combined effects of programs in Extension's different program areas have touched upon the effects of coordination of programs across two areas, and on perceived cumulative results from several program areas. But no studies have been found which sought to measure interactive effects or incongruous results of programs in different Extension program areas.

EVALUATING 2013, SPEETS OF FEETS.

3000 :

Policy Control of the and the and a control of the

Series on the impacts of temporaling the strong of the str

conveniences of Entension program was found to less expensed of the Miller-

entions lighted efforts to case on the continued estacts in 17 27 state of second southern upon the estacts of continue second second or continue continue continue case of the continue case of c

ARTHUR DESIGNATION

10

Reassignment of impact evaluation responsibility away from individual Extension program areas where it is now typically lodged, to a unit responsible for program evaluations, would facilitate studies on the interrelatedness of program impacts across two or more of the four program areas.

Social scientists can assist Extension in accountability and program improvement, and simultaneously strengthen the integrity of the social sciences, by focusing on and conducting multi-program area impact studies.

If rement of impact evaluations responsibility a propose of interest where it is not that the small testilite;

Openious test two or more of the impact of the impact of the impact of the interest to the account of the interest to the account of the interest to the account of the interest accou

CONTENTS

Preface	i
Abstract	ii
Introduction	1
Development of an Extension Evaluation and Accountability System	2
The Organization of Extension Program Evaluation	4
Implications of Weakness in the Integrative Aspect of Extension Accountability	6
Integrative Aspects of Extension Program Evaluation and the Social Sciences	10
Past Approaches to Evaluating Joint Effects of Extension Programs	11
Recommendations on Extension Program Evaluation Responsibilities	14
Implications for Social Scientists	16
References	19

Seed .

त्रे वर्ग रा हिराह्माराच्या हैकडीएटर उन उन्हें के नकान्यर तिर्मार डिप्टरेश रेस वर्गावा वर्ग हेर्रामार्थावा एन्ट्रमुख्या हेल्डरेसाई ton

Ons of Wakness in the Internetive Aspect of Extension

tive Aspect. of Extending Riogram Evaluation and Ma Socre

icher ta Englishing School Effacts of Enterining Preparation forms or Extension Property in Notices on Resembles to No.

ics for Socral Sciencess

2 -29

EVALUATING JOINT EFFECTS OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS* Introduction

The Cooperative Extension system is examined in this paper as a case example in arguing for the importance of identifying through evaluative research the joint effects of different programs or program areas of an agency. Joint effects, results or consequences are defined as those which are produced in common by two or more programs or program areas. This paper cites the advantages of a broader look at the effects of Extension than of observing results of Extension programs only on a program-by-program basis. Because evaluation research is an applied branch of the social sciences, this paper links the relevance of evaluating joint effects of programs to the issue of integration within the social sciences.

This paper is based on the premise that any public agency should report the interconnections of the actual consequences of its various programs and program areas. Such reporting is necessary although obviously not sufficient for adequate accountability. This premise is based on the notion that the echelons of legislation and policy-making, and also the public at large, need integrative information on program results so as to intelligently determine the role(s) of government in addressing societal problems. Lack of understanding of the consistency or inconsistency of impacts of publically supported programs can lead to, for example: 1) funding programs which cancel each other's effects, leaving the problem(s) unsolved and the public treasury depleted; or 2) failure to fund programs that heighten the positive effects of other public programs, thus limiting both the solution of problems and the efficient use of tax monies.

^{*}By Claude F. Bennett, Program Analyst, Program Analysis Staff, Joint Planning and Evaluation, Science and Education Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Suite 101, Rosslyn Commonwealth Bldg., Arlington, VA. 22209.

AT ON ARM (SISHIFES RE ITORATES

intradoction

despending Entended volume of providing to a color for the deports

a bifects or trafferent paragram or and

iene and the transfer of the second of the

स- 1-ର ବା ଜାବନ ଓ ଅଧିକ । ଜଣ ଅଟେ ଅଟିଆ

many at the transition of the contract

relevance to evaluating a me est.

in within the occal schices.

Such reporting it necessary although should

ned policy-maxing, and also the oublits or 'orag ne recover's plant of the cole(s) of

on inconsistency or impacts of publically soupered or orders an effect of the sound of the sound

Constant of unserved and the public temperature of effects of their purific meanage.

<u>Development of an Extension Evaluation and Accountability System</u>

Among agencies concerned with economic and social development, the Cooperative Extension system has one of the longest histories. In Extension's evolution as a significant arm of the land-grant universities, the scope and diversity of its programs have become increasingly wide. Extension provides nonformal education plus technical assistance, and occasionally service, to a range of audiences including food producers and consumers, community leaders, youth and families, those with low-income, the elderly, and urban as well as rural residents.*

A mandate by the United States Congress in 1977 for an evaluation of the economic and social consequences of Extension programs sent shock waves through the Cooperative Extension system. They still reverberate. The Congressional mandate constituted a quantum leap in the demand for national Extension accountability, on top of increasing requirements for individual State Extension Services to improve their accountability.** These developments, plus a current (1980-1981) United States General Accounting Office survey of the Cooperative Extension system at the Federal level and in several States, have added incentive to the work of the National Task Force on Extension Accountability and Evaluation Systems (Boyle, 1981). This task force has been charged by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)*** with proposing an

^{*}See "The Cooperative Extension Service," Chapter II in <u>Evaluation</u> of Economic and Social Consequences of Cooperative Extension Programs. Science and Education Administration, Extension, 1980.

^{**}For example, see Joint Legislative Review Commission, <u>Virginia</u>
<u>Polytechnic Institute and State University</u>, Extension Division. Virginia
<u>General Assembly</u>, 1979.

^{***}ECOP is a committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and represents the State Extension Services in their cooperative relationship with USDA.

E se surret na

e address the control of the second of the s

The Chisenand of Felg Rear programs of the Chisenand of t

control of the Complete of Cooperative Catential Engages and Catential E

on franchist on 32 7 and

overall approach to describing, evaluating and reporting Extension's program objectives, audiences, resource allocation, processes and results.

Agency accountability has many dimensions, but the definition of accountability in this paper is confined to communicating the <u>results</u> of agency program efforts to legislative and executive authorities. Program impact evaluations are herein briefly defined as formal, science-based studies of agency-clientele interaction and the results of such interactions for clientele and others in the society. Program impact evaluations are a major means by which an agency becomes nationally accountable.* This paper will focus on Extension's national accountability, and its impact evaluations, but the paper applies also in many respects to State Extension accountability and evaluations.

A program evaluation and accountability system for Extension, as for other multi-faceted agencies, should involve the "integrative aspect" of agency accountability. The integrative aspect of an agency's program evaluation and accountability focuses on interaction among an agency's programs and the results of such interactions. The integrative aspect may also include examining the interaction and joint effects of the agency's programs with those of other agencies. However, the agency is perhaps less responsible for this latter type of integrative evaluation than for studies of the joint effects of programs within the agency.

^{*}Other major means of external accountability may include public hearings on an agency, the commissioning of expert or authoritative review of an agency's work, anecdotal reports by an agency on the effectiveness of its work, and management information system reports.

modes to occur este and a country of the section into

Atting shalpat you garlide to prefactionable to make and a younge of earth.

Afternoon testings not formore.

The Organization of Extension Program Evaluation

At both the State and Federal levels, Cooperative Extension is typically structured along four (to six) program areas—agriculture (and natural resources); home economics (and nutrition); 4-H youth; and community and rural development. Program areas have goals, subject matters, audiences, etc., which together with leadership and staffing extend usually from the county, to the area, to the State, to the Federal levels. In its early years, Extension's workers combined their efforts toward the farm family: the agricultural agent worked with the farmer, the home agent worked with his wife, and the 4-H agent worked with their children. Over the years, this coordinated approach to education has diminished, with each program area tending to go its own way, with fewer attempts to mesh program objectives and activities.

During the past twenty years, less than five percent of studies with research findings on the impacts of Extension programs have exceeded the scope of any one Extension program area.* Studies rarely exceed the scope of a single program area, e.g., 4-H, partly because program area directors at the State and Federal levels are typically responsible not only for developing and implementing programs, but also for evaluating and reporting on those programs.

^{*}A recent review and appraisal of analytical studies according to evaluative research standards found methodologically warranted program impact findings in 45 studies of agriculture and forestry programs, 25 studies of home economics programs, 27 studies of human nutrition programs, 28 studies of 4-H youth programs and 16 studies of community and rural development program. Studies with warranted findings encompassing more than one Extension program area totaled eight (Kappa Systems, Inc., 1979).

of easy less shuttes seems in evaluations of easy the easy of the teast of each of the teast of the easy of ea

no weive

Accountability statements are prepared by each program area director in conjunction with Extension budget proposals and program accomplishment reports. Thus, Extension program area leadership typically sponsors or conducts studies to describe, and to measure and evaluate the results of individual programs in the program area. Academic studies of Extension program results—though not sponsored by the Extension organization—have tended also to focus on programs within a single program area.

Studies commissioned as part of the Congressionally mandated evaluation of Extension programs (SEA-Extension, 1980) were conducted wholly within each of the four typical Extension program areas; consequences of Extension programs and programs areas were thus also reported wholly along program area lines.*

Extension's annual budget justification statements to the Congress (e.g., USDA, SEA, 1980), which include reports of program results, are also written entirely on a program area-by-program area basis.

Extension's overall accountability efforts, then, are reduced as a rule to reports on the several major Extension program areas. Exceptions to the rule of evaluation and accountability structured by program area have occurred, and these will be referenced later in the paper relative to suggested modification of the organization of Extension's program evaluation and accountability efforts.

^{*}The mandate from Congress (United States Congress, 1977) was for an evaluation "including [my emphasis] those programs relating to agriculture . . ., home economics, nutrition education . . ., community development and 4-H youth." The mandate thus did not necessarily dictate that the program areas be reported on only as separate entities.

ent of east respond by the proposition of the standard of the

r ing Extension angents at the common secure size to

son desente sindre

edisection of the sent that in and the sent to the sen

This annual bucket just freelight, abuttoness on the press of the contract of

in ston's overall account oblits offerts, then, erg magned a rule of the several major Extension or the several major Extension or age of the several major Extension of the several major of the paper of the common of the content of the paper of the common of the content of the paper of the content of the

in e arcyr stated to the feet on engine.

Implications of Weakness in the Integrative Aspect of Extension Accountability

Policy-makers and legislators generally allocate funds to different agencies relative to their respective anticipated contributions to solving societal problems considered according to priorities (Rivlin, 1971). Anticipated agency contributions are based partly upon policy-makers' and legislators' estimates of past agency contributions to solving specified problems. In helping legislators and policy-makers to estimate the agency's ability to tackle identified problems, the agency should evaluate and report the joint effects of its programs and program areas as well as the effects of its particular programs and program areas. Considering the anticipated impacts of an agency's programs or program areas simply on a one-by-one basis can lead to misestimates of the total amount of resources which should be allocated to multi-faceted agencies like Extension.

In the case of Extension, the agency's total anticipated effects on a problem (including any joint effects of programs in the several Extension program areas) should be considered in budgeting for <u>nonformal education</u> to address the identified problem. Alternative approaches to addressing the same identified problem—i.e., the approaches of formal education, research, subsidies, loans, technical services, regulation, economic incentives and cost—sharing—should be compared with nonformal education when determining a policy approach and subsequently allocating necessary funds to the array of public agencies.

is the specific and all the secretary to

on? Erterand, the epon of the contract of memory as in the several areas) should be unaldered to bedgeth the numbers and all several areas) should be unaldered to bedgeth the numbers and all the numbers and the contract of formal management and the contract are negligible for a feet to be compared attn medicanal education of the second of the second

For example, the combined anticipated impact of Extension's four program areas relative to a national priority of energy conservation might be the focus in Federal funding for Extension. Extension's part in the overall anticipated impact of nonformal public education on the nation's energy problem through its programs with, e.g., farmers, agri-business, homemakers, community leaders and youth, could be compared with the anticipated impacts on energy conservation of:

(a) formal education in publically supported schools; (b) research to produce energy conserving technologies; (c) subsidies or loans to enable the use of energy saving technologies; and (d) regulatory enforcement of the use of energy saving devices and practices. Extension's nonformal education on the advantages and means of energy conversation may, of course, have differing degrees of compatibility with other approaches to energy conservation.

Likewise, in considering budgeting for Extension relative to other agencies in regard to achieving adequate <u>quantity</u> and <u>quality</u> of food supplies, any complementary, supplementary or conflicting relationship of Extension's program areas should be considered. Commenting on the design of the evaluation of the consequences of Extension's programs in response to the Congressional mandate of 1977, a Citizens' Review Panel stated (SEA-Extension, 1980: Appendix 1):

"Many key policy issues are not addressed. There is no attempt, for example to assess the interrelatedness of Extension's components. What are the dynamics among the four program areas? What happens if those in the agriculture program champion the use of pesticides to increase the farmer's crop yields while those in home economics are concerned about the harmful effects of such chemicals?"

The state of the complete control of the control of

vices and practices. Estenated

"I of enemaly content tion may of the page."

silts with other approaches in the content of th

facy key policy issues are no. autrocced intered is no extern). The parentle is no extern). For parentle in assess the intered test of Externion's component: What are the dynamics among the factor and amonas? What repress if they among the factor of posticular program shampled the use of posticular the comparison of posticular the comparison of the com

One may raise other questions similar to those posed by the Citizens'
Review Panel regarding the consistency or conflict of consequences within and among Extension's program areas. For example, livestock, poultry and crop production programs increase food supplies, insofar as they are successful, which tends to decrease unit prices of commodities within inelastic markets.

Do such production-oriented programs thus diminish the effects of Extension farm management and marketing programs which are oriented toward enhancement of farm income? Also, while Extension community development programs seek to help produce greater employment opportunities, one of the purposes of Extension home economics programs is to promote thrifty family production and consumption of goods and services. Do Extension home economics programs thus tend to limit employment growth through promoting family economic activities rather than marketplace activities? If so, what may be the implications of any such competing effects for the overall Extension budget in view of State and Federal priorities and shifts in these priorities?

The question of both intended and unanticipated <u>complementary</u> impacts among the program areas should be raised also. Three examples may suffice. (1) Both Extension community development and home economics program areas include objectives to improve family housing or to lower its costs. Yet, the typical organization of Extension program evaluation along program area lines provides no vehicle for examining cumulative or complementary impacts of housing programs in both the community development and home economics program areas. (2) How do the home economics and 4-H program areas complement or supplement each other in child and youth development and in family relationship programs? Programs in these two program areas with similar intent of this nature appear to be seldom considered for joint planning or evaluation at the State or Federal levels in

P313& ather mumerions and in other (P80)

ends to designes and ended of a second secon

end shifts in the order and and among the salest among the action of bot intended and analysis and and another and another and and another and actions as a soleter and the action and another and the action and allowed and action and action and action and action of the action and action and action of the action and action action and action action action action action action action and action actio

Extension. (3) All program areas appear to develop adult leadership at the local, county and State levels: 4-H cultivates lay leaders for 4-H organizational development and programs; community development helps to strengthen local and county reputational and positional leaders; agriculture programs help to develop commodity production and marketing leaders; and family living education programs help to prepare local citizens for a variety of community leadership roles. Communities and other jurisdictions cannot cope or thrive without effective leadership (Lassey, 1972). But what is Extension's contribution across all program areas to developing the leadership of nonmetropolitan America? Given the importance of the question, it is surprising that Extension has not attempted to supply an answer. In summary, in decisions on resource allocations to Extension and to other agencies, it would seem important to know the total Extension impact on problems such as housing, child development and adult leadership development.

Finally, how do the four Extension program areas interconnect, cumulate or diverge relative to their impacts on various demographic audiences or clientele categories, e.g., low-income persons, families or communities? And, how do total Extension impacts on given problems compare with or relate to total impacts of other agencies?

Extension programs may or may not be aimed at having interrelated impacts. Nonetheless, it is important to explore whether Extension programs do have joint, beneficial or adverse impacts, and (if so) to consider such impacts in program budgeting and planning. A recent publication by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) reported selected examples of Extension program results under ten national goals, e.g., reduced unemployment, improved housing, and improved health (VandeBerg, 1979). Examples of program results under each goal were drawn typically from two or more Extension program areas.

(3) All Broamen areas appear to consist each earth about y and first levels. A-b softwater:

development and programm; community hydrage and y reputational and positional baders:

"Succeedity production of a first leaders:

Shell to prefere local citizens on a carred one community and other familiable. It carred one as leadership (aussey, 15-4 out an and light program are importance of the man.

All program are importance of the man.

Stemmind to supply or as well.

Alternation for to problem and to other each as a second and to supply or as well.

mally, now do the Your Feterally present were great effective to their empetts has varietally cost empt

ies, .g., low-income persons, Families o note, is as her xtension impacts on gives ecoplems course with in higher to the agenties?

ilon , grams may or may not be aired at having interp .d
ess, it is important to explore whether increasing program da have
andficial or adverse impacts, and lift soint centurer sour impacts.

ing. A recent put inceren by the salens on Committee

(ECC) readabled selected estimples of Extension

goals, e.g., reduces a analogues, taprovag

979] imples of ecopyar readilis

re Ex distant apply in a s.

This supports the inference that some Extension leaders perceive that accountability simply on a program area-by program area basis has less than maximum relevance to policy officials in the Federal executive and to the Congress.

Integrative Aspects of Extension Program Evaluation and the Social Sciences

Extension lacks accountability on its overall impact as a system, but there is a parallel in the social sciences. Leading social scientists such as Mills (1959), Gouldner (1970) and Habermas (1970, 1973) have charged that the effectiveness of the social sciences in contributing to governmental policy has been impaired by their over-reliance on a technical approach to problem solving and under-reliance on a holistic approach. These authors assert that the fragmentation and isolation of most social research avoids integrative concepts useful to policy considerations. Gregg et al. (1979:56) assert that:

"Social life does form a totality, and we must see it as a totality if we are to choose social policies wisely.

"Social science seems to have endorsed a kind of rationality that fragments and isolates—a kind of rationality appropriate to technical problem-solving but not to developing holistic conceptions of social life that could become topics for public debate on social policy issues.

Mills, Goulder, Habermas, and Gregg et al. identify a major reason for the near absence of integrative efforts in the social sciences by pointing out that social science has become intimately tied to the practical problems of existing bureaucratic control. Gregg et al. (1979) declare that as early as 1940, Robert Lynd diagnosed the social sciences as suffering from a tendency to focus on the

more de tine informaço distingui densi a instant estanti a Estitat estanty on a program area-as receism. Lost a Calevan e i molley déficéals e tou Feaseat

ntegranive Aspects or Extensis

Conspon Parks a countability , it may rost

67 | 64 | 74 | 146 | 200 | 144 | 50 | 200 | 200 | 30 | 144 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |

Goulever (1976) son Heberrs. 1973)

Myeness of the forlal scheeps whenth still 1:

meatrer by the activity of tentage

lar-reliance un a holfet : approach, fres

to correct teller for our teller one con tel

to policy convident one. Them is al. 129

"Sectal life does form a totality, as α as α is α to a section α as a totality M we see to choose what α and α when α

"Social science forces to have served thed of reliability that fragments and isolater-a kind of selective appropriate to sechnical problem-sulvano but not to developing holistic conceptions of sector life that combecome topies for gubile debeké on social policy issues.

s Goulder, Haberman, and Grege ex al. identify a meta a season and ocion magazine and content of metal and colors and concerns and magazine that the practical problems of existing ancertain and colored that an early as load. Tabore 1. Orange et al. (1979) coolers that an early as load. Tabore colors that an early as load. Tabore

administrative problems of various social institutions and thereby they fail to examine the combined impact of those institutions on the lives of individuals and to American culture as a whole.

Lynd's diagnosis is clearly exemplified by the organization of Extension program evaluation. The existing, overwhelming concern regarding impacts of Extension programs within single program areas is appropriate to rational problem-solving for or within these Extension program areas. But, focusing almost totally upon program impacts within a single program area excludes adequate examination of how Extension program results in two or more program areas complement or conflict in relation to societal needs, governmental policies and program objectives.

Past Approaches to Evaluating Joint Effects of Extension Programs

Extension's need to strengthen the integrative aspect of its program evaluation and accountability justifies referencing the limited number of instances, known to the author, where program impacts of interrelated programs have been studied or compared. Those who aim at evaluating joint effects of programs may find help in such references. It is not the purpose of this paper to comment on the adequacy of the evaluative research methodology of the following, but rather to describe their focus.

1. Public Perception of Extension's Global Impacts.

Forest and Marshall (1977) interviewed a random sample of adults and a sample of community leaders in Shawano County, Wisconsin. Adults who had had considerable contact with Extension and the community leaders reported their opinions on the extent to which they and/or their county had benefitted from the overall Extension program (including all program area) in terms of, e.g., (a) home, health and safety, (b) natural environmental, and (c) economic improvement. Thus, the Shawano

county study focused on clientele's perceptions of the multiyear cumulative effect of all programs within a county Extension effort.

2. Studies of Small Family Farm Program Impacts.

Although emphasizing agriculture and economic impacts, studies by Hardee (1963), Ladewig and Edmondson (1972), and Strickland et al. (1976) reported evidence also on improvements in farm families' level of living. These studies focus on results for families of cooperation across two Extension program areas, i.e., agriculture and home economics.

3. Coordinated Studies of Extension Programs Having Similar Intent.

Programs in different Extension program areas, but having a similar objective—to assist people to recognize economic opportunities and improve their incomes—were studied by a national task force (Carpenter et al., 1980). Selected participants' perceptions of the impacts of the programs in which they had been involved (e.g., business and industry development; 4-H youth career development; small woodland management; small farms; and cottage industries) were obtained and compared as to the degree of similarity in reported economic results.

4. Convergence in Measured Consequences of Extension Programs.

The national review and appraisal of Extension Program impact findings from selected studies, 1961-1978, (Kappa Systems, Inc., 1979:1-14) shows some similarity of measuring devices (indicators) used in program impact studies in the several Extension program areas. Exhibit 1 presents these similarities.

the sent subsect is throughly so because forces for.

Shedles of Scall Educity Para Program (masche 1909) Shedles of training as it alkare on economy 1909;

by hardse (1907), undents and Edr sinckland et al. (1908) reported evidence

ann fam lies' leve of 199)ng. 25 ...

on man ක ඉත්ත්රීමක් පුරි ..ම.F . 2593

Programs III different interpolation programs in a second control in the polation of the programs of the program of the programs of the progra

miur) : sa furce (Carpenter sa al , 18-1)

The perceptions of the impachs of the production divisor of the page and involved (e.g., b) tovious and increase divisor of the page to th

ectine devicement; small modeling marinenet. The ectine with the comparation of similarity in capacital according result.

indiversed sin sesured Consequents of Eachers on and and approval of sension Aungra man and sequences of Session Aungra man.

tootes the street devices findication

ner one moranaina immayae are no colonia

Exhibit 1

Similar Extension Program Impact Indicators Across Extension Program Areas, from Among 149 Studies included in Summary (Vol. II) by Kappa Systems, Inc. (1979)

Program Impact Indicators	Presence of Studies Appraised To Have Methodologically Warranted Findings on Program Impacts, Identified by Program Area
Change in Level of Living	Studies in: agriculture, home economics and community development
Change in Income	Studies in: agriculture, home economics and community development
Change in Family Food Costs	Studies in: agriculture and home economics
Change in Outlook Toward Life	Studies in: home economics, community development and 4-H youth

Henry the sense of the sense of

Program Impact

reconditions

Channa in Layol of Livin.

resar ne spaces

Fire Car F. M. E.

tuse (first ni seed)

Cheapa in Outlick Studies in

To summarize, previous efforts in examining the joint effects of Extension programs have barely touched upon the effects of program area coordination, perceived cumulative results of several program areas, and complementarity and similarity of effects across programs and program areas. But, no studies have been found which sought to measure the "dynamic among the four program areas" (relative to the critique by the Citizens' Review Panel) in terms of any synergistic or non-synergistic effects of programs and program areas; nor have there been studies which measure the extent of any conflict or incongruity of program results across Extension programs or program areas.

The author acknowledge that the technical problems in evaluative research on multi-program and multi-program area effects may be difficult. This is especially the case where there is lack of clear definition of the overall objectives for (a) total county, State or national Extension efforts, or for (b) individual programs at the county, State or national levels.

Recommendations on Extension Program Evaluation Responsibilities

In their seminal work on Federal evaluation policy, Wholey, et al., (1970:69-70) recommended that evaluation responsibilities be gauged to decisions at the policy-making and program management levels.

"Policy-makers most often are called upon to make choices among national programs, while program managers are most often called upon to make choices of emphasis or decisions on the future of individual projects within national programs."

ve to the of the month of the contraction of the co

seen stucin, which has a ceer

results across Evissons or proprat a

tour acknowledge real c

-predering and multi-live in the case and the case of the case of the case and the

recommended that evaluation respons filths on among ing and program management levels.

maker; must often are called upon to make churces

of a programs, while prog a managers are most

defisions

duture of individual projects within reliand

out."

Wholey et al. suggest that to avoid conflict of interest situations, no program leader should be responsible for evaluating the impacts of programs under his/her immediate direction. Thus, Wholey and others recommend that program impact evaluations, including evaluations of the joint effects of two or more programs, be conducted by those responsible to the agency or to a higher organizational level. Program strategy evaluations, which evaluate alternatives in program methodology, should be the responsibility of those with immediate program direction. This assignment of major evaluation responsibilities is "one way to start getting useful, objective evaluations" (Wholey et al., 1970:70).

The author's application of Wholey's position to Extension is that

Directors and Administrators of State Extension work and the Administrator of
the Federal Extension unit should provide for central evaluation staffs with the
resources and authority to approve or conduct evaluations of program impacts.

Acceptance of this recommendation would mean a reassignment of Extension impact
evaluation responsibility away from the individual program areas*, where it is
typically lodged.

The major point of the above discussion on Extension program evaluation responsibilities is simple this: an advantage of assigning responsibility for impact evaluations to an evaluation unit is that it would facilitate the consideration of studies on the interrelatedness of impacts of the several program areas.

^{*}Extension program staff are ordinarily one set of users of evaluation studies, and should be members of advisory or steering committees to help guide evaluation efforts. Such guidance should include the posing of questions (e.g., as to the direction, audience, methodology and staffing of the program), which can be answered through evaluative studies. A realistic appraisal of the relative power of evaluation study units and program area units in Extension suggests the following principle: when authority for impact evaluations is vested with a central evaluation staff, program evaluation efforts can not long succeed without the consent and cooperation of program leadership.

Acres servers and to series at the servers of the s

idential of the above discussion on Extension programmed in the states of the control of states of the interrelatedness of impact the sevents of states on the interrelatedness of impact the sevents.

289

programs or advisory or steering committees to help quide

s. Such quidance slould intitude the posing of questions (2.0.)

inn, audiunce, methodology and staffing of the program), which
through evaluation such units and rocam area units in Extension

princip to when au nority impaction of forts can new loan

tiut staff, or gram evaluation efforts can new loan
and coperation of program leanership.

Elsewhere, it has been recommended (SEA-Extension, 1980) that a national evaluation policy group comprised of representatives of State Extension Services and USDA be charged with several responsibilities including (a) identifying national needs for information on Extension program impacts; and (b) recommending priorities to States and SEA-Extension for focus, scope and type of evaluative studies to be carried out in a particular time period. Such a national evaluation group would be free to identify needs for evaluations involving more than one program area, and to suggest the nature of studies to inspect the dynamics of objectives, activities and impacts of programs in different program areas.

Implications for Social Scientists

As Cooperative Extension continues to develop State and national evaluation and accountability systems, social and behavioral scientists who are not part of the Extension organization may be called upon increasingly to assist Extension in evaluations for more effective accountability and management (i.e., program improvement). Beyond assisting Extension relative to these two functions of program evaluation, social scientists should remember that there is yet another perspective on the role of program evaluation—the knowledge perspective.

Chelimsky (1977) has defined this perspective as follows:

"In this view, the purpose of evaluation is to establish evidence leading to new knowledge about . . . problems, and about the effectiveness of governmental strategies for addressing them . . ."

Thus, social scientists must choose a balance for their own work in Extension program evaluation among the management, accountability and knowledge functions of evaluation.

is exhern, it has been a recommend if in Saleration.

Let noticy grows comment of recreasable that it is the charge of the charge of the several recreasable that it is a set for information or ful origin. It focus, it is studied to it carried the comment of the charge of the comment of growing the comment of the charge of the charge of the charge of the charge of the comment of the charge of the ch

signature of more our mass on as also has are as the constitly yang, social and hebrylood screenings does to more set on as the constituent of more effective accountability our denaments.

The new effective accountability our denaments and and only beyond assisting fatenatous relative or these and reverse of program evaluations. The more of program evaluations. Inchiefus part of the contract of program evaluations. Inchiefus part of the knowledge about it are the knowledge about it are adding new knowledge about it are not seen and the contract of governmental attentions.

entistic must choose a balance for their numbers or Enthstore

In conceptualizing, designing and implementing, or consulting on holistic rather than fragmented Extension evaluation studies, social scientists need not be constrained by the "organizational blinders" which Extension (or any other agency) has adopted. It will be a test of the professionalism of social scientists to persuasively show Extension and other agencies, and legislative and executive policy-makers, the advantages to studies which transcend narrow programmatic interests and relate any joint impacts of programs to major national problems or goals. For example, a study of the joint effects of several Extension programs across program areas on how people, firms and communities cope with inflation could be useful to both program budget decisions and to social science.

Perhaps inter-disciplinary task forces will be best suited to advise Extension on the inclusion of, or to undertake, multi-program area studies within an overall agenda of evaluation studies. Each discipline will have valuable concepts to contribute. The sectors or areas of social well-being which a number of sociologists have dealt with (e.g., Klonglan et al., 1976; Ross et al., 1979) might be particularly useful conceptual tools for studies which are broad enough to comprehend competition, conflict, complementarity, cumulation, and synergism among Extension program areas. For example, many of the programs within the four areas in Extension could be hypothesized to bear jointly on the social well-being categories and subcategories of: (a) residential environment including community services; (b) economic status of individuals, groups and communities; (c) health and safety including human

Conceptual is one designing and remote the conceptual and resonant to the conceptual and resonant to the conceptual and concep

Ests to persuasively they feld

ict vs politi e-cohers, the dwarf :

ente : essi bus ilsamalai Misam

the printing the ma in a

ennight Istops

ept internal versity rask forces as a cost nited for a vertex the including of or in undertake, on the including vertex case of established and sectors of each of sectors of each of actologists have deritt eith feed.

1979 a glit be perticularly useful conceptual oca enough to computation. conflict. ... energies any,
on, and symertism among Extension program cass. For aromale
and within the four areas in Extension doubt on hypothesized now.
The suc allebting categories and subcategories of: [a]
and romant including community services; [b] represent examples and arother examples.

nutrition and chemical status of the environment; (d) personal and family status and adjustment; and (e) participation in governance including leadership structures, alienation and group cohesion.

As social scientists assist Extension with a system of evaluation studies (SEA-Extension, 1980:160-165) they can further Extension's accountability and management and at the same time strengthen the integrity of the social sciences by supporting multi-program area impact studies.

and characed stepping in the one makes to a

REFERENCES

- Boyle, P. 1981. "Preliminary Report." National Task Force on Extension Accountability and Evaluation Systems. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Chelimsky, E. 1977. "An Analysis of the Proceedings of a Symposium on the Use of Evaluation by Federal Agencies." Metrek Division, Mitre Corporation, Washington, D.C.
- Forest, L. and M. Marshall. 1977. "Impact of Extension in Shawano County." University of Wisconsin-Extension, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Gouldner, A. 1970. The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. Basic Books, New York.
- Gregg, C., T. Preston, A. Geist and N. Caplan. 1979. "The Caravan Rolls On: Forty Years of Social Problem Research," Knowledge--Creation, Diffusion, Utilization. Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Habermas, J. 1973. Theory and Practice. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Hardee, J. G. 1963. "Evaluation of an Educational Program with Part-Time Farm Families, Transylvania County, North Carolina, 1955-1960." North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C.
- Joint Legislative Review Commission. 1979

 State University: Extension Division. Virginia General Assembly, Richmond, Virginia.
- Kappa Systems, Inc. 1979. "Extension Program Impact Findings from Selected Studies Conducted from 1961-1978." Volume II. Arlington, Virginia.
- Klonglan, G., et al., 1976. "Toward a Methodology for Social Indicators in Rural Development." Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Ladewig, H. and V. Edmondson. 1972. "The Effectiveness of Nonprofessionals in Cooperative Extension Education for Low-Income Farmers." Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.
- Lassey, W. R. and K. Jones, S. Giebink and F. Seitz. 1972. The Kellog-Extension Education Project. Center for Planning and Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.
- Mills, C. W. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. Oxford University Press, New York.

Wy E, 1971. "An Acais, is of the Process Skaluar ton by Espend Room 195." Pat Afon a a as incton, D.

. E. and M. narchel "Tolouber ET (arealty of Wisconstan Eutersion, adress, War

1970. The Greening Eris of was 1970.

orly Years of Social Probes sears; Josephsons-Fr . The control of the control of

[8.] 1973. Theory ard Francisc Rescor Press. Box

Legis at ve Review Commission. 1970 Vindinia Polytochel Kastitukia State University: Extension Division. Vindinia Assembly.

Systems, Inc. 1979, "Extension Program ... Studie Conducted From 1961-1978" Volume II Arlington

era; et al., 1976. "loward a Methodology for Sociel Indicators era; elopment." Department of Sociology and Anthropology are University, Anes, lowa.

. H. acc V. Edmondson. 1972. "The Effectiveness 'according Education for Low-Income Farmer lity, liege Station, Texas.

 and K 'Jones, S. Grebink F. Saltz. 1972. The Kelling-Facility Rect. Genter for Planning and Development, University, Sozeman, Montana.

The Sociological Imag nation. Oxford University Press

- Rivlin, A. 1971. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Ross, P., et al., 1979. "Indicators of Social Well-Being for U.S. Counties." Economics, Statistics and Cooperative Service, USDA, Washington, D.C.
- SEA-Extension. 1980. Economic and Social Consequences of Cooperative Extension Programs. Report to Congress and Appendix 1. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
- Strickland, C., <u>et al</u>. 1976. "Nonprofessional Aides in Agriculture: An Evaluation of a Program in Cooperative Extension Education for Small Farm Families." Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Prairie View, Texas.
- United States Congress. 1977. "Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, Section 1459, Title XIV." United States Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- USDA, Science and Education Administration. 1980. "1980 Budget: Explanatory Notes." Washington, D.C.
- VandeBerg, G. 1979. "The Cooperative Extension Service in Transition." The University of Wisconsin-Extension, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Wholey, J., et al. 1970. Federal Evaluation Policy. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

nem vocale and produced the produced by the second second

Ross, I. d. di... 1879. "Inélicators of Surjot Well-aulmonfor List.
Countrielle Economic: Statistici et Coorerative Service; USDA,

Service Land Co. et al. 121s. Compares and Instantian Constitute for the Constitute for San Constitute for S

Intered States Courses the season and Agency States of 1977, Section 1979, 197

and the state of t

Vandeller in Solveni to Cooperat Lee Laster Lee Laster Cooperation (COO)

Wheley al '070. Federal Evaluation follow limited as

